

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Griselda Wilson,)	Civil Action No.: 4:17-cv-03318-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Genesis Healthcare, Inc.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g) (D.S.C.). *See* ECF No. 59. The Magistrate Judge recommends granting in part and denying in part Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc.*

¹ Objections were due by July 15, 2019. *See* ECF No. 59.

Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note))).

Having thoroughly reviewed the record, the Court finds no clear error and therefore **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s R & R [ECF No. 59]. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART** Defendant’s motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 44].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
July 16, 2019

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge